

09/758,804

REMARKS

Claims 3, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 44, 47, 48, and 49 have been cancelled. Claims 4, 23, and 40-43 have been amended. New claims 50-57 have been added. Claims 1-2, 4-10, 15-16, 21, 23-27, 37-43, and 50-57 are now pending in the application. No new matter has been added by amendment. Reexamination and reconsideration of the claims as amended are respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

6.) The Examiner rejects claims 3, 5, 22, 24, and 40-43 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner rejects claims 3 and 22. The claims have been cancelled and new claims 50-57 which are in product-by-process form have been added.

The Examiner rejects claims 5 and 24 for improper antecedent basis. Claims 4 and 23 have been amended thus providing proper antecedent basis.

The Examiner rejects claim 40 and states that "the claim is indefinite because the recitation "comprising" in line 1 does not clearly indicate how many crosses are to be performed by the method." Applicants have amended claim 40. The method now refers to the "first generation F1 PH6JM-derived maize plant".

The Examiner rejects claim 47. Claim 47 has been cancelled.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

7.) The Examiner rejects claims 9-20, 28-44, and 47-49 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The Applicants traverse the rejection. Claims 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 44, 47, 48, and 49 have been

09/758,804

The Examiner rejects claims 9, 10, 28, and 29, that claim the F1 hybrid seed and F1 hybrid plant made with PH6JM as a parent. Applicants have cancelled claims 28 and 29. One of ordinary skill in the art would know how to cross PH6JM with another maize plant. The F1 hybrid seed and plant produced using PH6JM, regardless of the other maize plant used, is identifiable because it will have one set of alleles coming from PH6JM. One of ordinary skill in the art would be able to run a molecular profile on PH6JM and the F1 hybrid and be able to identify the F1 hybrid as being produced from PH6JM. Seed pericarp tissue, which is solely maternal in origin, can be used to discern the maternal or paternal origin of the allele sets if necessary. See page 16 of Poethig, R.S. 1982. Maize, the plant and its parts. In: W.F. Sheridan (Ed.) Maize for Biological Research, University of North Dakota Press, Grand Forks, ND. pp. 9-18, submitted as Appendix A.

As stated in the specification on page 16, lines 8-23, there are many laboratory-based techniques available for the analysis comparison and characterization of plant genotype such as Restriction Length Polymorphisms (RFLPs) and Simple Sequence Repeats (SSRs). Such techniques may be used to identify whether or not PH6JM was used to develop a hybrid. Applicants also point out that any breeder of ordinary skill in the art will know the identity of both parents used to produce a hybrid.

The Examiner rejects claims 14-17. Claims 14 and 17 have been cancelled. Claims 15 and 16 remain pending and are to methods of developing a maize plant through the utilization of PH6JM. Applicants point out that anyone of skill in the art would know how to utilize the well established breeding methods with PH6JM. Description of such occurs throughout the specification and descriptions can also be found in introductory plant breeding books.

The Examiner rejects claims 40-43. Claims 40-43 have been amended. Claim 40 is to the method of producing a first generation F1 PH6JM-derived maize plant. Applicants point out that this claim is to a method and requests that

09/758,804

hybrid, is identifiable through both breeding records and molecular marker techniques as discussed above. Claim 42 is to the method of selfing the first generation F1 PH6JM for successive filial generations. This is a basic and well known breeding methodology, and the use of this methodology with PH6JM is described in the specification on page 21, lines 1 to 15. Claim 43 is to plants derived from claim 42 that have at least 50% of their genetics derived from PH6JM. These claimed plants are clearly described by their method of production, which requires the use of PH6JM. Such plants must be produced through the use of PH6JM and the Examiner acknowledges that PH6JM is clearly identified. Further, Applicants have added the limitation of at least 50% inheritance from the PH6JM side of its pedigree to further emphasize the significant influence of PH6JM in the claimed product. Genetic inheritance has been accepted by both courts and governmental agencies as an accurate and reliable means of identification. In paternity cases courts routinely compel genetic testing of putative fathers to establish paternity, and federal law mandates that states have laws requiring that genetic test results be admissible in such cases without the necessity for foundation testimony or other proof. 42 U.S.C. 666(a)(5)(F)(iii)(Supp. V 1999). In such cases, a child will, on average, inherit 50% genetic contribution from each parent. Similarly, the plants produced by the method of claim 42 will also, on average, inherit 50% genetic contribution from each parent.

The Examiner states that, "the specification does not describe any molecular determinants that one would need to identify any genetic material as having been derived from PH6JM." Applicants traverse. As described in the specification, lines 8-23 on page 16, the seed deposit allows one of ordinary skill to run a molecular profile of PH6JM. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art may test material they desire to use in breeding to determine if it is PH6JM. In order to expedite prosecution Applicants submit the molecular profile of inbred line PH6JM in the declaration of Dinakar Bhatramakki attached hereto as Appendix

09/758,804

representative sample of which has been deposited with the ATCC. For example, see Ex parte Marsili, Rosetti, and Pasqualucci, 214 USPQ 904 (1972), in which the Patent and Trademark Office Board of Appeals held that it was not new matter to amend the structure of a compound when a more refined analytic investigation showed a corrected formula. The Board, relying on well established cases of In re Nathan et al., 51 CCPA 1059, 328 F.2d 1005, 140 USPQ 601 (1964); In re Sulkowski, 487 F.2d 920, 180 USPQ 46 (CCPA 1973); Spero v. Ringold, 54 CCPA 1407, 377 F.2d. 652, 153 USPQ 726 (1967), and Petisi et al. v. Rennhard et al., 53 CCPA 1452, 363 F. 2d 903, 150 USPQ 669 (1966), concluded that the "products described, exemplified and claimed by Appellants inherently had and have now the structure given in the amendment in question. Consequently, the changes made in this amendment do not constitute new matter. Marsili at 906. Similarly, in the present case, inbred line PH6JM inherently had and still has the SSR marker profile being added. As described previously, one of ordinary skill in the art can use molecular markers to identify PH6JM, a transgenic version of PH6JM, a backcross conversion of PH6JM and the F1 plant of the transgenic version and backcross conversion of PH6JM.

The Examiner states that, "describing a plant that by saying it expresses 2 particular traits does not distinguish it from any other plant that expresses the same traits." Applicants point out that those claims referenced by the Examiner require the utilization of PH6JM to develop such plant. In order to expedite prosecution the claims identifying progeny by traits have been cancelled.

The Examiner also states that the morphological and physiological traits of PH6JM progeny are not described. The test of written description does not require a morphological and physiological description. Rather, it is whether subject matter was described in such a way to convey to one of ordinary skill in the art that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. While PVP is distinct from patents, the scope of protection conferred by PVP provides a clear indication that breeders of ordinary skill in the art consider mutations, F1 hybrids,

09/758,804

closely related progeny easily and routinely created through the use of this newly developed line are encompassed within the scope of the invention of the variety itself. The fact that the progeny have not been created does not prevent them from being protected in this manner. As stated in MPEP 2163 (3) (a), "An invention may be complete and ready for patenting before it has actually been reduced to practice."

PH6JM-derived progeny are described by the fact that PH6JM is utilized in a breeding program to make the PH6JM-derived progeny, PH6JM gives genetic contribution to the PH6JM-derived progeny, and the genetics of PH6JM are described by ATCC deposit of PH6JM seed. By limiting the progeny to one breeding cross away from PH6JM and by limiting the progeny to those that contain at least 50% of their genetics from PH6JM, the Examiner's concern that the breadth of claims is not adequately described is addressed.

The Examiner also rejects claims 37-39 under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph. Claims 37-39 are directed to growing out an F1 hybrid in which PH6JM is a parent and searching for PH6JM inbred seed. Due to the imperfect process of seed production parent seed can sometimes be contained in the hybrid seed bag. This claim covers the method of searching for inbred PH6JM seed within a bag of hybrid seed. The method is clearly described in the specification on page 5, line 21 through line 7 on page 6. One of ordinary skill in the art can practice such a method without undue experimentation. The Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw his rejection to claims 37-39.

The Examiner rejects claims to transgenic PH6JM plants and PH6JM plants comprising single gene conversions. New claims 50-57 are drawn to methods and to the products produced by those methods. The claims include the well known methods of producing backcross and transgenic conversion plants. The product by process claims are further limited by specified conversion or transgenic traits, which include the traits of insect resistance, herbicide resistance, disease resistance, waxy starch, and male sterility.

page 21, lines 16-34, and also on page 23, line 19, through page 32, line 28. At the bottom of page 8 of the office action the Examiner suggests that the claims be amended to include a list of transgenes. In order to expedite prosecution new claims 51 and 55 list the type of traits that may be conferred by backcross conversions and transgenes. However it should be noted that PH6JM comprising a transgene, even if it is for a transcription factor, is distinct from another inbred line comprising that same transgene and still retains the benefit of Applicants' invention. Claim 51 also specifies that PH6JM is used at least twice as a recurrent parent in the development of a backcross conversion plant. Breeders, by using molecular markers, may obtain up to 98% genome identity between the backcross conversion and the recurrent parent after two backcrosses. See Marker-assisted Selection in Backcross Breeding, Openshaw, S.J. et al. Marker-assisted selection in backcross breeding. In: Proceedings Symposium of the Analysis of Molecular Data, August 1994, pp. 41-43. Crop Science Society of America, Corvallis, OR (1994) included as Appendix D. Inbred PH6JM transformed to comprise a transgene is also easily identifiable through the use of molecular markers. The transgenic version of PH6JM would have the same molecular profile as PH6JM, with the possible exception of a marker used in the profile that is located at the site of transgene insertion. However, in this case, the plethora of other identical markers would identify the line as a transgenic variant of PH6JM.

In the specification on page 4, lines 7-13, it states, "Backcrossing can be used to transfer a specific desirable trait from one inbred or source to an inbred that lacks that trait. This can be accomplished, for example, by first crossing a superior inbred (recurrent parent) to a donor inbred (non-recurrent parent), that carries the appropriate gene(s) for the trait in question. The progeny of this cross is then mated back to the superior recurrent parent followed by selection in the resultant progeny for the desired trait to be transferred from the non-recurrent parent." The method of backcrossing genes into an inbred maize plant is well

09/758,804

included in the Information Disclosure Statement). In the specification, on page 21, lines 16-34, there is a description of how to backcross traits into PH6JM, which includes the claimed traits. Examples of how one of ordinary skill in the art can transfer a gene conferring a qualitative trait into a variety through backcrossing is demonstrated by the fact that the commercial market now distributes a multitude of products produced in this manner. Such conversion lines are easily developed without undue experimentation. Poehlman et al. (1995) on page 334, submitted in the information disclosure statement, states that, "A backcross-derived inbred line fits into the same hybrid combination as the recurrent parent inbred line and contributes the effect of the additional gene added through the backcross." Wych (1988) on page 585-86, also submitted in the information disclosure statement, discusses how the male sterility trait is routinely backcrossed into an inbred line and how this is used to produce a sterile/fertile blend of an F1 hybrid in order to reduce seed production costs. In fact, many commercial products are produced in this manner, and those of ordinary skill in the art consider the F1 hybrid produced with the male sterile (backcross conversion) inbred to be the same variety as the F1 hybrid produced with the non-backcross conversion inbred.

As a result of the repeated use of the recurrent parent, the backcross conversion has many genetic alleles in common with the recurrent parent. Thus, genetic analysis may be used as a means of identifying the backcross conversion. The F1 hybrid made with a transgenic version or a backcross conversion of PH6JM is also identifiable by the use of genetic markers, because the hybrid would contain one set of alleles from each parent.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

7.) The Examiner rejects claims 18-20 and 47-49 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains,

or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same.

47-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

09/758,804

Claims 18-20 and 47-49 have been cancelled and new claims 50-53 have been added. The Examiner states, "The specification teaches that single gene conversions, or introgression, of the disclosed maize plant through traditional breeding is contemplated (page 21, lines 15-30). However, the specification does not teach any PH6JM plants comprising single gene conversions. It is not clear that single genes may be introgressed into the genetic background of a plant through traditional breeding."

The Examiner has cited Hunsperger, Kraft, and Eshed and stated that they "teach that it is unpredictable whether the gene or genes responsible for conferring a phenotype in one plant genotypic background may be introgressed into the genetic background of a different plant, to confer a desired phenotype in said different plant." The Examiner states that, "Hunsperger et al. teach that the introgression of a gene in one genetic background in any plant of the same species, as performed by sexual hybridization, is unpredictable in producing a single gene conversion plant with a desired trait (column 3, lines 26-46)." Applicants respectfully disagree that this is what is taught by Hunsperger et al. Hunsperger et al. teaches that a gene that results in dwarfism of a petunia plant can be incorporated into other genetic backgrounds of the petunia species (See column 2, line 67 to column 3, lines 1-4). Hunsperger et al. merely discusses that the level of the expression of that gene differed in petunia plants of different genetic backgrounds. Hunsperger et al. succeeded in incorporating the gene into petunia plants of different genetic backgrounds. Therefore, Hunsperger et al. support the fact that one can introgress a specific trait into a recurrent parent through backcross conversion. Applicants' specification provides ample disclosure of starting materials such as maize inbred PH6JM, a discussion of traditional breeding methods, and examples of transgenes and naturally occurring genes that may be used in such methods. Hallauer et al. (1988) on page 472, submitted in the information disclosure statement, state that, "For single gene traits that are relatively easy to classify, the backcross method is effective and relatively easy to manage."

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the cited

09/758,804

The Examiner goes on to state that, "Kraft et al. teach that linkage disequilibrium effects and linkage drag prevent the making of plants comprising a single gene conversion, and that such effects are unpredictably genotypic specific and loci-dependent in nature (page 323, column 1, lines 7-15)." Applicants disagree that the article states such points. Kraft et al. make no mention of a plant comprising a single gene conversion or the use of backcrossing. Further, Kraft et al. relates to linkage disequilibrium and fingerprinting in sugar beet, a crop other than maize. Kraft et al. state, on p. 326, first column, "The generality of our results for other crop species needs to be investigated."

It is understood by those of skill in the art that backcross conversions are routinely produced and do not represent a substantial change to a variety. The World Seed Organization, on it's web site, writes, "The concept of an essentially derived variety was introduced into the 1991 Act of the UPOV Convention in order to avoid plagiarism through mutation, multiple back-crossing and to fill the gap between Plant Breeder's Rights and patents." As determined by the UPOV Convention, essentially derived varieties may be obtained for example by the selection of a natural or induced mutant, or of a somaclonal variant, the selection of a variant individual from plants of the initial variety, backcrossing, or transformation by genetic engineering. The commercialization of an essentially derived variety needs the authorization of the owner on the rights vested in the initial variety." International Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants, as amended on March 19, 1991, Chapter V, Article 14, Section 5(c), (emphasis added). A copy of the relevant portion of the UPOV Convention and the World Seed Organization web site is attached as Appendix C.

An example of how one of ordinary skill in the art can transfer a gene conferring a qualitative trait into a variety through backcrossing is demonstrated by the fact that the commercial market now distributes a multitude of products produced in this manner. Such conversion lines are easily developed without undue experimentation.

09/758,804

into the same hybrid combination as the recurrent parent inbred line and contributes the effect of the additional gene added through the backcross."

The Examiner goes on to state that, "Eshed et al. teach that in plants, epistatic genetic interactions from the various genetic components comprising contributions from different genomes may affect quantitative traits in genetically complex and less than additive fashion (page 1815, column 1, line 1 to page 1816, column 1, line 1). The Applicants would like to point out on page 1816, column 1, lines 1-5 of the Eshed et al. article it states, "Recent studies that detected epistasis of selected QTL in *Drosophila* (Long et al. 1995), soybean (Lark et al. 1995) and maize (Doebley et al. 1995; Cockerham and Zeng 1996) did not show a less-than-additive trend." Emphasis added. Applicants also add that transferring a qualitative trait does not require undue experimentation. Please note Hallauer et al. (1988) on page 472, submitted in the information disclosure statement, which states, "For single gene traits that are relatively easy to classify, the backcross method is effective and relatively easy to manage." Claim 51 has been amended to expedite prosecution. In claim 51, the genes transferred into PH6JM are now limited to the traits of herbicide resistance, insect resistance, disease resistance, male sterility, and waxy starch.

8.) Examiner rejects claim 14. Claim 14 has been cancelled to expedite prosecution.

In light of the amendments to the claims and the foregoing arguments the Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103

9.) The Examiner states that, "Claims 17, 33, 36, 41, and 43 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kramer (U.S. Patent No. 2,913,524) and *in the alternative*

09/758,804

as was indicated in the office action dated June 5, 2002. Applicants traverse the rejection.

Applicants have cancelled claims 17, 33, and 36. Applicants have amended claims 41 and 43. Claim 41 is to the first generation F1 developed from crossing PH6JM with a second plant. Claim 43 is limited to progeny produced by the method of claim 42, which requires the use of PH6JM, and is further limited to progeny deriving at least 50% genetic contribution from PH6JM.

The Examiner states that product-by-process claims may be properly rejected over prior art teaching the same product produced by a different process." PH4TF is not PH6JM, nor can PH4TF be created through the use of PH6JM with one breeding cross. Thus, claims 41 and 43 are not anticipated by PH4TF. As evidenced by the declaration of Stephen Smith submitted as Appendix E, both PH6JM and its progeny within the scope of claims 41 and 43 are distinct from PH4TF taught in U.S. Patent No. 6,124,530.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection to claims 41 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) and 103(a).


Claims 1-2, 4-10, 15-16, 21, 23-27, 37-43, and 50-57 are now pending in the application. The amendments made herein do not in any way change the claim scope which the Applicants believe is allowable but is meant to hasten the issuance of the patent.

09/758,804

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that in light of the foregoing amendments and the remarks, the claims 1-2, 4-10, 15-16, 21, 23-27, 37-43, and 50-57 requested. If it is felt that it would aid in prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number indicated to discuss any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,
Candice Gardner and
Gary Henke



Steven Callistein
Reg. No. 43,525
Attorney for Applicants

Steven Callistein
Pioneer Hi-Bred International
7100 NW 62nd Avenue
P.O. Box 1000
Johnston, IA 50131-1000
(515)-254-2823